

Times which described the White House as "exceedingly eager to support a law that promises to change the welfare system," which is to say abolish title IV-A, Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

It went on to say the White House was "sending increasingly friendly signals about the bill."

This is a bill which three professors at the Columbia School of Social Work, including the revered Alfred Kahn, said would recreate the turn-of-the-century era in which the children of single mothers were referred to as "half orphans" and sent to orphanages.

In reaction, 40 States established mothers' pensions, the forerunner of aid to dependent children. The 1935 legislation created aid to dependent children. In 1939 the mother was entitled to a benefit, hence family with dependent children.

They said, "It is our hope that 100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era."

Mr. President, I spoke this morning not only about the New York Times this morning but rather of yesterday's statement, a statement by Rahm Emanuel, a White House spokesman, who said as the bill headed toward a vote on final passage, Rahm Emanuel, a White House spokesman said it was "moving in the right direction." "Moving in the right direction," is moving in the direction of the misbegotten and shameful era which took place at the turn of the century from which we gradually recovered our senses.

I have since been in touch with the White House. I have talked to persons there and asked, can it be that this is the disposition of the White House? I am told that, yes, Mr. Emanuel, who I believe was the fundraiser for the 1992 Presidential campaign of Mr. Clinton and then was political director in the White House, that he is in charge of this matter now and that it is his view that the Democratic Party should abandon its commitment 60 years in place—a commitment Republican Presidents have been just as firm in—to a Federal provision of aid to dependent children.

Mr. President, Rahm Emanuel is of that view, and obviously he is, he does not disguise it. I wonder about what other political advice he is giving in the White House.

I will not speculate. I will state my alarm. No one can foresee the future. I do not. Yet we have seen something like this happen before. I can say again, when Irwin Garfinkel, Alfred Kahn, and Sheila Kamerman refer to the possibility that "100 years later the Nation might be spared another such misbegotten and shameful era before regaining senses," they say that hope grows dim.

If this is the advice the President is getting, that hope is dim, indeed. I say this with great reluctance, Mr. President, but something of great importance, in my view, is at stake. I yield the floor.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period of time for morning business be extended until 4:30 under the previous unanimous consent request.

Mr. DODD. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire as to how much longer that will go? Are we going to have some sense of—

Mr. SANTORUM. My understanding is the two leaders are meeting. In fact, I believe they may be meeting as we speak, and we are trying to find an agreement on the legislation before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a period for the transaction of morning business be extended until 5 p.m. under the same rules governing the previous unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry.

Are we in morning business, as I understand it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

#### CHILD CARE

Mr. DODD. Madam President, I will take advantage of this time while we are waiting here. Let me explain. People are wondering what is going on—I have a podium in front of me and papers in front of me. I am prepared at some point to offer an amendment on child care. We had one vote already several days ago and made an effort here to try to come to some accommodation, a compromise position on child care. That may still happen. I was

hopeful that the arrangement put together would work—and it may still work.

I am prepared to offer the amendment. I have been here on the floor now for virtually the last 2½, 3 days, trying to find a compromise. I am trying hard to find a welfare reform package I can vote for. I mean that very sincerely and deeply. I think the President would like to have a bill he could sign. And largely what happens, I suppose, in the next couple of hours might determine whether or not we will have a bipartisan bill.

My own view, Madam President—I will not take a lot of time here because people have heard this debate on numerous occasions in days past, weeks past, months past. Senator HATCH of Utah and I offered, back some 6 or 7 years ago, the child care and development block grant bill, which became the law of the land in 1990. Five years ago, we provided child care assistance to people in the country, particularly to the working poor families to keep them off welfare and allow them to work. It allowed them to get some child care assistance—it does not take care of everybody—it provides some help to some people. There are long waiting lists in many States for this assistance. In fact, I recall now—having recited these statistics so many times, I can almost call them State by State.

As the presiding officer is from the great State of Texas, I think the waiting list in Texas is about 20,000 people. In the State of Georgia, it is 41,000 people. The numbers are in that range. And the 36 States that keep data on child care slots—not every State keeps waiting lists—but 36 States tell us that they have long lists. There is a tremendous need and demand out there.

Again, I think the central point of the Dole welfare reform bill is, of course, to get people from welfare to work. And again I think most people accept the fact that 60 percent of the people on welfare have children under the age of 5. Of the 14 million people on welfare, 5 million are adults, 9 million or 10 million are children. So what we are talking about here is a simple enough notion; that is, to provide some sort of a safe setting for children as we move their parent or parents into the work force.

To do that requires resources. We are told by the Department of Health and Human Services that to fill the 165-percent increase in demand that would occur as a result of the bill that the majority leader has presented to us, it would require some \$6 billion over 5 years to accommodate that demand.

I offered an amendment in that amount a few days ago. It failed by a single vote here. Then, over the last 2½ days, in consultations with interested parties here—and I will not go into names of people—we were able to work out a compromise, a bipartisan compromise, on the issue. The compromise

reduced the \$6 billion by several billions of dollars, which would mean that we would not meet the full demand, based on the assessments that had been made, but would provide a pool of money for States. This would mean that Connecticut, Texas, New York, and other States would have a pool of resources to assist in the very legitimate issue of how you move people from welfare to work.

Now, the bill requires that we move 25 percent of all welfare recipients to work in the first 2 years, and 50 percent by the year 2000. That will place great demands on States to make that transition. If they cannot meet the demands, of course, they face penalties in the bill. It probably would be less expensive for most States to pay the penalty than actually to comply with the law. I made that rough calculation. I think it is a common interest of ours to achieve compliance with the requirements.

To achieve compliance, you need to have some training for these people. But most people would agree, if you had to pick one issue, one issue that is critical for moving welfare recipients to work, it is child care. Every survey of people on public assistance, that asks what are the greatest obstacles to moving from welfare to work, cite as the number one obstacle the lack of child care. In every survey that I have seen in the last decade or more, that is the single most important issue, and I think with complete justification. You need not have ever been on public assistance or even have had family members on assistance to understand this issue. Anyone with young children, regardless of their economic status, who works or desires to work, understands completely the anxiety that another person would feel when going to work without some safe, adequate place to leave their children. It is just unrealistic to assume that you can reasonably move someone from welfare to work without accommodating that need.

Now, it can be accommodated in a variety of ways. No one is arguing that if there are grandparents or aunts or uncles or older children—there may be a variety of ways to reach that need. I think most would agree that those arrangements will not work in every case. You are going to have to have some other system in place. If it were not true, then you would not have the waiting lists I described already with literally thousands of children on those waiting lists to find an adequate child-care place.

So, Madam President, I will, at an appropriate time, offer, or try to offer, an amendment on this issue. It may be defeated. I hope it will not. I made an honest and sincere effort to compromise, as I believe the very rationale for this institution is to bring people of different points of view together and try to find some common ground on issues.

I really know of no one arguing, no one saying we should not do anything

about child care. Most people agree we should do something about it. It is how we do it and what means we use. I have tried to come up with an answer here that would accommodate the Governors, the needs of the States, and obviously the very people that we are going to be asking to make that transition in the law.

So, I will offer the amendment at an appropriate time. If it is defeated, we will move on, I guess, to other amendments. I hope that will be the case, that we will not be talking about pulling down the bill or other suggestions that may be made. It is a difficult issue. The Senator from New York knows better than all of us put together, as he has talked about so eloquently on numerous occasions, dismantling 60 years of social policy in a matter of hours.

So the fact that this is taking a little longer may be troublesome to some people. Frankly, were it to be done in haste, it would even be, I think, more dangerous. I am hopeful that we can adopt an amendment in this area. I would like to be a part of an agreement. That is my desire. That has been my intention. There is no other purpose behind this.

I have been involved in the issue of child care for more than 10 years. Going back to the 1980's, I felt it was a legitimate issue that needed to be raised for a whole host of reasons. In the midst of this debate, it is a critical issue. In the absence of it, it is impossible to call this reform in any way. We should not literally turn our back on the needs of these 10 million children out there.

As I said a moment ago, of the 14 million people in this country on welfare, with all of the rhetoric and language we use in the most virulent terms to describe them, we should remind ourselves that 10 million of the 14 million we are talking about are infants and children, who in most cases, through no fault of their own, as the Senator from New York pointed out, are in this world.

The question becomes, if no one else will help try and take care of them, shouldn't someone? And if that someone has to be us, I do not know any reason why we should shrink from that responsibility as we try to break this cycle.

I see my colleague from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, may I simply endorse everything the Senator has said, and add a further point. We have a choice in this legislation. We can have child care or we can have orphanages. I think child care is the least expensive option, but you do not know how bad an orphanage might be.

We are not just at the end of 60 years of social policy. A century ago, in response to the matter of sending half-orphaned, as they were known, to orphanages that some 40 States, beginning in Wisconsin, began mothers' pensions. The States found it difficult to main-

tain them in the midst of the Depression, and they were incorporated into the Social Security Act as aid to dependent children.

That is the issue before us, as best one can tell, although one can never tell the future.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I see the distinguished Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I want to take a moment of the Senate's time, first of all, to commend my friend and colleague for the efforts that have been made over the period of the past 2 days. I welcome the opportunity to cosponsor the amendment; I welcome the chance to join with others in cosponsoring this amendment.

When you look over the record and realize that this initial amendment, which was the \$11 billion over 5 years, just failed by two votes, the efforts by Senator DODD to cut that back by several billions of dollars in an attempt to try and reach out and make this a bipartisan effort is really in the tradition of this body.

It is troublesome to many who recognize that under the Dole proposal there is not a single cent dedicated to child care, not a single cent that is actually dedicated.

So we have seen a significant reduction in the proposal and a very extended effort to try and incorporate many of our friends and colleagues on the other side who, over a long period of their own careers, have been absolutely committed to child care and who are committed to child care at this time.

I want to indicate to our friends and colleagues, really on both sides, that his efforts to try and ensure this was going to be a bipartisan effort and consistent with the exigencies of the budget consideration has been absolutely an honorable effort and in the best traditions of the Senate.

Let me just say, I look forward to supporting that proposal because I do think that upon reflection, in spite of what is talked about in the back rooms about whether I will vote or whether I will not, that when people are faced with this issue of trying to take a small but meaningful step forward on child care will recognize the importance of their vote in a very significant piece of legislation and will ultimately support the Dodd proposal. That would certainly be my hope, so that we could move on to some of the other issues.

Finally, Madam President, I do not think there is any Member of this body who has children—and so many of us are blessed to have them—who would possibly think of starting a day without knowing their whereabouts and knowing about their safety and knowing about their security, knowing about their well-being.

I think all of us in this body are fortunate enough to have a day-care center that was developed in a bipartisan way in the Congress. We have the kind of day care available for employees of the Senate that we are denying to so many others who are attempting to work for a great deal less than we are receiving, in terms of salaries, trying to make ends meet.

We hear a great deal, as we did in the early part of the year, Washington does not get it because the laws we pass we do not apply to ourselves. Remember that? We went through a whole discussion and debate about that. And we should apply the laws that we pass for others to ourselves.

But the other shoe fits, too, and that is what we do for ourselves we might think about doing for others. What we have done is afforded the child care program, and now we are being asked to try and move people off welfare and basically avoid the fundamental commitment of trying to provide some child care to those individuals.

As Senator DODD and Senator MOYNIHAN understand very completely, that program just will not work. That just will not work. The idea that you are going to be able to take these resources, which is flat funding over a period of time, when about 85 percent of those resources are being used for benefits, and think that you are going to be able to scrape some funding out for child care, I think, does not hold water.

We have seen very little indication, given what has happened in the States, as the Senators from Connecticut and New York have pointed out, that is happening today and why we ought to expect it to happen in the future.

So, Mr. President, this is really about the priority of children. Every day so many speeches are made about children and about the most vulnerable. We have an opportunity to address those needs with the Dodd amendment. I think all of us should be impressed by the seriousness of the redressing of this issue.

It has been as a result of a long, painstaking, tireless effort by the sponsor of this amendment to try and broaden out and to work this process in a way that would have bipartisan support and would make a very important and significant improvement in the legislation. I am hopeful that when it is offered, that it will succeed. I think this will certainly be one of the most important votes that we will have in this session.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I have heard some speeches on the floor of the Senate and this ranks right up there. I do not know how you say—when the leader here is negotiating, in good faith, to in fact add more money into the child care fund—that somehow or another we are denying the fact that we need child care, and have Members

on the other side who insist on having their name sketched next to the child care money, to throw out an agreement to do just that. I think that is not cooperation by any stretch of the imagination.

To also suggest that somehow we provide day care for workers here in the U.S. Congress and that we are not willing to do so in the welfare bill—maybe the Senator does not know it, but the people who have children in day care pay for that with the hard-earned dollars that they work for.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. No, I will not yield. They work for it with their hard-earned dollars. What you are suggesting is to give money to people to go to work, to give them child care to go to work.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. No, I will not yield. The fact of the matter is that what the Senator from Connecticut is doing is trying to block an agreement from happening by insisting on an amendment on day care, which we are willing to sit—and have been for hours—and try to put together.

I am hopeful that we can get through the partisanship on this and move forward in a bipartisan way. And I know there are many Members on the other side of the aisle that want to work in a bipartisan fashion to get this bill through, to get day care money funded, because it is a sincere interest, I know, of the leader and of other Members on our side to get this legislation through with additional day care funds.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. We will and have been working. I object to the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts stands up and says we are giving free day care here in the Congress, and we are providing it for our folks when, in fact, they pay for that day care, and that we are unwilling to give it to people on welfare, when, in fact, we are going to be giving day care to people on welfare.

I just think you are mixing who is paying for what. The fact of the matter is, people working here paying for their day care are paying taxes to subsidize the people that we want to provide day care for under the welfare bill. Let us get it straight.

I am willing, as other Members on this side are, to put some more money in for day care so that people can get off of welfare. But do not try to suggest that somehow we are providing perks to Members here that we are unwilling to give on welfare. Exactly the opposite is the truth.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to propound a unanimous-consent re-

quest as soon as it has been cleared by the Democratic leader. I intend to finish this bill today one way or the other, even if there is not going to be a welfare bill. We have been at this for several hours in good faith. In the offer we made, which was rejected by the Senator from Connecticut, there is, over 5 years, \$3 billion. I think his amendment was 5—

Mr. DODD. That was not the offer.

Mr. DOLE. We just changed it. He had \$5.7 billion over 5 years. We said, OK, we will go more than halfway, to \$3 billion over 5 years.

Mr. DODD. That is the first time this Senator heard that offer.

Mr. DOLE. My view is that is what the Senator wanted.

Mr. DODD. I will be glad to look at that. We can put in a quorum call. I say that with all due respect to the Senator.

Mr. DOLE. We changed it about an hour ago. As I understand it, it is more than halfway to where the Senator was with his amendment the other day. We checked it with some others, and they think this is a very generous, responsible offer. That would be \$8 billion over 5 years set aside for child care.

Mr. DODD. If the Senator will yield. We know each other very well, and I just say that offer was not presented to me. I would not say that if it were not the case.

Mr. DOLE. Then I will present it to you now.

Mr. DODD. Let us put in a quorum call and see if we can get the details.

Mr. DOLE. I do not think we have a problem here.

Mr. DODD. We may not.

Mr. DOLE. We have taken care of maintenance of effort and the job training. We are going to make it free-standing, under a time agreement. And contingency grant funds, which we did not have in our bill, was sponsored by the Senator from Ohio, Senator DEWINE. He thought about \$530 million was appropriate. We made it \$1 billion. So if some State has a calamity, they do not have to pay it back. We kept the loan funds of \$1.7 billion, and we have accepted some of the triggers suggested. The work bonus program, that has been done.

On the vouchers, we have not reached an agreement, but we have increased the hardship exemption in the bill from 15 to 20 percent. We have added \$75 per year for abstinence education, which has broad support. And program evaluation, of interest to the Senator from New York, and others, \$20 million to evaluate the program. If that is not enough, we can raise it to \$25 million.

I talked to Dick Nathan, who suggested that amendment; he is a well-respected academic. Food stamps, which we have discussed with the Democratic leader, has certain escape hatches. We do not think it punishes anybody.

We think it is a good package, and we think we can complete this whole bill in a couple of hours.

Mr. DODD. If the majority leader will yield—and I say this with great respect